UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/965,148	09/28/2001	Masataka Okayama	H-1014	6260

7590 06/01/2006	**EXAMINER**

Mattingly, Stanger & Malur, P.C.
Suite 370
1800 Diagonal Road
Alexandria, VA 22314

HOSSAIN, FARZANA E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2623	

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/965,148	OKAYAMA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Farzana E. Hossain	2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 April 2006*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,46-58* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6 and 46-58* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *09-28-01* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05)
Office Action Summary
Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20060524

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   This office action is responsive to communications filed 04-18-2006. Claims 1-6,

46-58 are pending. Claims 7-45 are cancelled. Claims 1-6, 46 are amended. Claim 47

is original. Claims 48-54 are new.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments, see Pages 11-12, filed 4-18-06, with respect to the

rejection(s) of claim(s) 46-47 under Bisdikian et al (US 6,047,317) have been fully

considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn.

However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of

Pietraszak et al.

3.   Applicant's arguments, see Pages 12-13 filed 4-18-06, with respect to the

rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 2 under over Hendricks et al (US 5,990,927) in view of Prus et

al (US 2005/0144651) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the

rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of

rejection is made in view of Pietraszak et al or Zigmond et al.

        Applicant arguments for 103 rejections of claims 3-6 are made disclosing that the

3rd reference used to find the limitations for each of the claims does not disclose the

exclusive memory in Claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5.   Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 46-49, 54-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Pietraszak et al (US 2005/0177849 and hereafter referred to as

"Pietraszak").

        Regarding Claim 1, Pietraszak discloses a data receiving apparatus for receiving

data transmitted via a broadcast wave or an electric communication line (Figure 2, 60,

Figure 3, 60, 61, 62, 63, Page 4, paragraph 0039), comprising a receiving unit for

receiving the data (Figure 2, 60, Figure 3, 60). Pietraszak discloses an electronic

program guide loader or loaders for different service providers (Figure 2, 70, Figure 3,

70, 76) to load the data or EPG information which includes a decoder for decoding the

data and the data is collected (Page 4, paragraphs 0041, 0042). It is inherent for each

loader to include a buffer to store the data as the loader is extracting data and the data

is taken from the loader to the main storage unit. Pietraszak discloses a storage unit for

storing received data (Figure 2, 60, 42, Figure 3, 42, 60, 61, 62, 63); and a processing

unit (Figure 2, 40, 41, 60, Figure 3, 40, 41, 60, 61, 62, 63) for securing in the storage

unit an exclusive memory area which is exclusively usable by a provider or a sender of

the data in the storage unit or an EPG loader specific to a service provider or sender of

data who has exclusively uses the loader which necessarily includes a buffer (Figure 2,

40, 41, 60, Figure 3, 40, 41, 60, 61, 62, 63, Page 4, paragraphs 0041, 0042) and also a

service provider has the power to exclude other senders of data from using the memory

or storage unit (Figure 3, 42, Figure 2, 42) by using a priority (Page 5, paragraphs 0044,

0052) as the exclusive means to exclude or the power to exclude.

Regarding Claim 46, Pietraszak discloses a data receiving apparatus (Figure 2,

20, Figure 3, 20) for receiving data transmitted via a broadcast wave or an electric

communication line (Figure 2, 70, 76, Page 4, paragraph 0039), comprising: a receiving

unit for receiving the data (Figure 2, 60, Figure 3, 60); a storage unit for storing received

data (Figure 2, 42, Figure 3, 42); and a processing unit (Figure 2, 40, 41, Figure 3, 40,

41) for securing a priority memory area which is usable by priority by a provider or a

sender of the data with respect to a user of the data receiving apparatus in the storage

unit (Page 5, paragraphs 0044, 0052, Figure 2, 40, 41, 44, Figure 3, 40, 41, 44).

Regarding Claim 47, Pietraszak discloses a service center apparatus (Figure 2,

70, Figure 3, 70, 75, 76) for managing a data receiving apparatus (Figure 2, 20, Figure

3, 20) via an electric communication line (Figure 2, 70, Figure 3, 70, Page 4, paragraph

0039), comprising: means for communicating with the data receiving apparatus (Figure

2, 70, Figure 3, 70, Page 4, paragraph 0039); and means for determining if a priority

memory area usable by priority by a data provider or a data sender with respect to a

user of the data receiving apparatus has been secured in a storage unit of the data

receiving apparatus (Page 5, paragraphs 0044, 0052, Figure 2, 40, 41, 44, Figure 3, 40,

41, 44).

Regarding Claim 54, Pietraszak discloses a data receiving method for receiving

data transmitted via a broadcast wave or an electric communication line (Figure 2, 60,

Figure 3, 60, 61, 62, 63, Page 4, paragraph 0039). Pietraszak discloses an electronic

program guide loader or loaders for different service providers (Figure 2, 70, Figure 3,

70, 76) to load the data or EPG information, which includes a decoder for decoding the

data and the data is collected (Page 4, paragraphs 0041, 0042). It is inherent for each

loader to include a buffer to store the data as the loader is extracting data and the data

is taken from the loader to the main storage unit. Pietraszak discloses a storage unit for

storing received data (Figure 2, 60, 42, Figure 3, 42, 60, 61, 62, 63); and a processing

unit (Figure 2, 40, 41, 60, Figure 3, 40, 41, 60, 61, 62, 63) for securing in the storage

unit an exclusive memory area which is exclusively usable by a provider or a sender of

the data in the storage unit or an EPG loader specific to a service provider or sender of

data who has exclusively uses the loader which necessarily includes a buffer (Figure 2,

40, 41, 60, Figure 3, 40, 41, 60, 61, 62, 63, Page 4, paragraphs 0041, 0042) and also a

service provider has the power to exclude other senders of data from using the memory

or storage unit (Figure 3, 42, Figure 2, 42) by using a priority(Page 5, paragraphs 0044,

0052) as the exclusive means to exclude or the power to exclude.

Regarding Claim 56, Pietraszak discloses a service center apparatus (Figure 2,

70, Figure 3, 70, 75, 76) for managing a data receiving apparatus (Figure 2, 20, Figure

3, 20) via an electric communication line (Figure 2, 70, Figure 3, 70, Page 4, paragraph

0039), comprising: means for communicating with the data receiving apparatus (Figure

2, 70, Figure 3, 70, Page 4, paragraph 0039). Pietraszak discloses an electronic

program guide loader or loaders for different service providers (Figure 2, 70, Figure 3,

70, 76) to load the data or EPG information, which includes a decoder for decoding the

data and the data is collected (Page 4, paragraphs 0041, 0042). It is inherent for each

loader to include a buffer to store the data as the loader is extracting data and the data

is taken from the loader to the main storage unit. Pietraszak discloses a processing unit

(Figure 2, 40, 41, 60, Figure 3, 40, 41, 60, 61, 62, 63) for securing in the storage unit an

exclusive memory area which is exclusively usable by a provider or a sender of the data

in the storage unit or an EPG loader specific to a service provider or sender of data who

has exclusively uses the loader which necessarily includes a buffer (Figure 2, 40, 41,

60, Figure 3, 40, 41, 60, 61, 62, 63, Page 4, paragraphs 0041, 0042) and also a service

provider has the power to exclude other senders of data from using the memory or

storage unit (Figure 3, 42, Figure 2, 42) by using a priority (Page 5, paragraphs 0044,

0052) as the exclusive means to exclude or the power to exclude, which reads on

means for determining if an exclusive memory area exclusively usable by priority by a

provider or a sender the data has been secured in a storage unit of the data receiving

apparatus (Page 5, paragraphs 0044, 0052, Figure 2, 40-42, 44, Figure 3, 40-42 44, 61,

62, 63).

Regarding Claim 57, Pietraszak discloses a data receiving method of managing a data receiving apparatus via an electric communication line (Figure 2, 70, Figure 3, 70, Page 4, paragraph 0039). Pietraszak discloses an electronic program guide loader or loaders for different service providers (Figure 2, 70, Figure 3, 70, 76) to load the data or EPG information, which includes a decoder for decoding the data and the data is collected (Page 4, paragraphs 0041, 0042). It is inherent for each loader to include a buffer to store the data as the loader is extracting data and the data is taken from the loader to the main storage unit. Pietraszak discloses a storage unit for storing received data (Figure 2, 60, 42, Figure 3, 42, 60, 61, 62, 63); and a processing unit (Figure 2, 40, 41, 60, Figure 3, 40, 41, 60, 61, 62, 63) for securing in the storage unit an exclusive memory area which is exclusively usable by a provider or a sender of the data in the storage unit or an EPG loader specific to a service provider or sender of data who has exclusively uses the loader which necessarily includes a buffer (Figure 2, 40, 41, 60, Figure 3, 40, 41, 60, 61, 62, 63, Page 4, paragraphs 0041, 0042) and also a service provider has the power to exclude other senders of data from using the memory or storage unit (Figure 3, 42, Figure 2, 42) by using a priority (Page 5, paragraphs 0044, 0052) as the exclusive means to exclude or the power to exclude.

Regarding Claim 2, Pietraszak discloses all the limitations of Claim 1. Pietraszak discloses that the storage unit has a user memory area for storing received data in accordance with an instruction from a user of the data receiving apparatus (Pages 5-6, paragraphs 0044, 0052, 0056).

Regarding Claim 5 and 55, Pietraszak discloses all the limitations of Claims 1

and 54 respectively. Pietraszak discloses that a service provider can have the power to

exclude other providers from storing or updating or loading data in the storage unit

based on priority (Page 5, paragraph 0042). It is necessarily included that an identifier

is added to the received data, as the processing unit determines if the received data is

data to be stored in the exclusive memory area (Page 5, paragraph 0042).

Regarding Claim 6, Pietraszak discloses all the limitations of Claim 1. Pietraszak

discloses an electronic program guide loader or loaders (Figure 3, 60-63) for different

service providers (Figure 2, 70, Figure 3, 70, 76) to load the data or EPG information,

which includes a decoder for decoding the data and the data is collected (Page 4,

paragraphs 0041, 0042). It is inherent for each loader to include a buffer to store the

data as the loader is extracting data and the data is taken from the loader to the main

storage unit. Pietraszak discloses that the storage unit (Figure 3, 42, 61-63) has a

plurality of exclusive memory areas logically separated from one anther in association

with a plurality of providers or senders (Figure 2, 60, Figure 3, 60-63). See rejection 1.

Regarding Claim 48, Pietraszak discloses all the limitations of Claim 1.

Pietraszak discloses the storage unit (Figure 3, 42, 61-63, Page 5, paragraph 0044) has

a plurality of exclusive memory areas logically separated from one another in

association with a plurality of providers or senders (Figure 2, 60, Figure 3, 60-63),

wherein at least one of the plurality of memory areas is restricted memory area

subjected to restriction of at least one of writing, reading, alteration, and deletion of the

data based on an instruction from a user of the data receiving apparatus or there are

storage or record locations that data cannot be written, altered, or deleted based on a

priority set by a user for a particular provider (Pages 5-6, paragraphs 0044, 0052).

Regarding Claim 49, Pietraszak discloses all the limitations of Claim 48.

Pietraszak discloses that the other memory areas (Figure 2, 42, Page 5, paragraph

0044, Figure 3, 61-63, 42) other than restricted memory area (Figure 2, 42, Page 5,

paragraph 0044, Figure 3, 42) stores main data about a broadcast program can be

provided by TV station or satellite provider (Figure 3, 74, 76); and the restricted memory

area stores sub data about a commodity sales such as a pay per view movie (Pages 5-

6, paragraph 0046, 0052, Figure 3, 75). Note: the EPG data can be restricted to any

provider.

Regarding Claim 58, Pietraszak discloses all the limitations of Claim 57.

Pietraszak discloses that the EPG writer determines the maximum amount of EPG data

allowed so that the data does not exceed the maximum storage amount, which reads on

determining the entire memory capacity (Page 4, paragraph 0042).

6.   Claims 1, 2, 6, 48-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Zigmond et al (US 6,698,020 and hereafter referred to as "Zigmond").

Regarding Claims 1 and 54, Zigmond discloses a data receiving apparatus

(Figure 4, 68, Figure 5, 80) for receiving data transmitted via a broadcast wave or an

electric communication line (Figure 4, 52, 62, 64, 66, 60, Figure 5, 80), comprising a

receiving unit for receiving the data (Figure 2, 60, Figure 3, 60), a storage unit for

storing received data (Figure 5, 82, 81). Zigmond discloses the system is a processing

device to perform certain functions, which reads on a processing unit performing

functions (Column 6, lines 48-67). Zigmond discloses that the ad insertion device or

data receiving apparatus with a processing unit performs the process of securing an

exclusive memory area which is exclusively usable by a provider or a sender of the data

in the storage unit or source of data or ad selection rules can be advertisers and the

advertisers will have sole control over the data (Column 11, lines 50-65, Figure 4, 62) as

the exclusive means to exclude or the power to exclude.

Regarding Claim 2, Zigmond discloses all the limitations of Claim 1. Zigmond

discloses that the storage unit has a user memory area for storing received data in

accordance with an instruction from a user of the data receiving apparatus (Column 10,

lines 35-63, Column 11, lines 50-64).

Regarding Claim 6, Zigmond discloses all the limitations of Claim 1. Zigmond

discloses that the storage unit (Figure 5, 81, 83) has a plurality of exclusive memory

areas logically separated from one anther in association with a plurality of providers or

senders (Figure 4, 62, 66). The electronic program database stores main data about a

broadcast program (Column 11, lines 1-12), it is well known in the art for delivering

programming information (Column 11, lines 5-10). It is necessarily inherent that

programming information is delivered from a program information source or a

programming source. Zigmond discloses a further embodiment of a programming

database being associated with a programming source (Figure 8, 66, 140) providing

information to the receiving apparatus.

Regarding Claim 48, Zigmond discloses all the limitations of Claim 1. Zigmond discloses the storage unit (Figure 5, 82, 81) which stores the data and has a plurality of memory areas logically or physically separated from one another (Figure 5, 82, 81), wherein at least one of the plurality of memory areas is a restricted memory area subjected to restriction of at least one of writing, reading, alteration and deletion of the data based on an instruction from a user of the data receiving apparatus (Figure 5, 82).

Regarding Claim 49, Zigmond discloses the limitations of Claim 48. Zigmond discloses that wherein those memory areas which are other than the restricted memory area store main data about a broadcast program (Figure 5, 81); and the restricted memory area stores sub data about a commercial or service providing offer (Figure 5, 86, 83, 82).

Regarding Claim 50, Zigmond discloses the limitations of Claim 49. Zigmond discloses the processing unit for changing sub data included in the main data to the sub data stored in the restricted memory area and displaying the main data containing the changed sub data on a display unit or the ad selection criteria uses the parameters and rules to change the sub data or advertisement (Figure 5, 83, Column 11, lines 13-49).

Regarding Claim 51, Zigmond discloses the limitations of Claim 50. Zigmond discloses that the processing unit changes sub data included in the main data to the sub data stored in the restricted memory area when making a decision that an expiration period of the sub data included in the main data has passed or with any time sensitive advertisements another advertisement can replace it (Column 14, lines 4-12).

Regarding Claim 52, Zigmond discloses the limitations of Claim 50. Zigmond

discloses that the processing unit changes sub data included in the main data to the sub

data stored in the restricted memory area in accordance with a priority order

predetermined for the sub data stored in the restricted memory area or a certain

advertisement is displayed in reference to a specific program being displayed (Column

12, lines 66-67, Column 13, lines 1-3), an advertiser makes it a priority that his

advertisement is shown regardless of programming (Column 12, lines 44-59), the profile

of a particular viewer creating the priority of the advertisements (Column 2, lines 33-43),

or the viewer selecting a particular advertisement or a default advertisement (Column

17, lines 3-9).

Regarding Claim 53, Zigmond discloses the limitations of Claim 49. Zigmond

discloses comprising a processing unit for inserting the sub data in the main data and

displaying that sub-data inserted main data on a display unit (Figure 5, Figure 6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Pietraszak in view of Hanai et al (US 2005/0160455 and hereafter referred to as

"Hanai").

        Regarding Claim 3, Pietraszak discloses all the limitations of Claim 2. Pietraszak

discloses the processor is able to determine storage amount (Pages 4-5, paragraph

0042-0043). Pietraszak also discloses storing EPG data and recordings (Page 6,

paragraph 0056). Pietraszak is silent on displaying memory capacity. Hanai discloses

an entertainment system which a provider transmits data to the user's receiver (Figure

1, Figure 2). Hanai discloses processing unit or record manager displaying on a display

unit an unused memory capacity or available capacity (Page 4, paragraph 0051), a

used memory capacity (Figure 10, Page 4, paragraph 0051) of the user memory area.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Pietraszak to include processing unit or record manager

displaying on a display unit an unused memory capacity or available capacity (Page 4,

paragraph 0051), a used memory capacity (Figure 10, Page 4, paragraph 0051) of the

user memory area as taught by Hanai in order to for the receiver to choose the optimal

record media based on program data quantity (Page 1, paragraph 0008) as disclosed

by Hanai.

9.   Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Pietraszak in view of Fell et al (US 6,674,994 and hereafter referred to as "Fell").

Regarding Claim 4, Pietraszak discloses all the limitations of Claim 1.

Pietraszak discloses an electric communication line (Figure 2, Figure 3). Pietraszak is

silent on the processing unit transmitting an entire memory capacity based on a

predetermined schedule upon reception of a request. Fell discloses a transmitter and a

receiver for delivery of a data file (Column 2, lines 3-7). Fell discloses that the controller

or processing unit transmit the storage capacity in accordance with a predetermined

schedule or a scheduling order upon the reception of a request or the transmitter sends

a data file upon a request via a scheduling order and based on the storage capacity of

the receiving side the storage can be conducted at the receiving side (Column 6, lines

1-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify Pietraszak to include processing unit transmit

the storage capacity in accordance with a predetermined schedule or a scheduling

order upon the reception of a request (Column 6, lines 1-15) as taught by Fell in order to

have a automated transfer of files in a cost effective manner (Column 1, lines 21-24) as

disclosed by Fell.

10.   Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zigmond

in view of Fell et al (US 6,674,994 and hereafter referred to as "Fell").

Regarding Claim 4, Zigmond discloses all the limitations of Claim 1.   Zigmond

discloses an electric communication line (Figure 4, 52, 64). Zigmond is silent on the

processing unit transmitting an entire memory capacity based on a predetermined

schedule upon reception of a request. Fell discloses a transmitter and a receiver for

delivery of a data file (Column 2, lines 3-7). Fell discloses that the controller or

processing unit transmit the storage capacity in accordance with a predetermined

schedule or a scheduling order upon the reception of a request or the transmitter sends

a data file upon a request via a scheduling order and based on the storage capacity of

the receiving side the storage can be conducted at the receiving side (Column 6, lines

1-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify Zigmond to include processing unit transmit the

storage capacity in accordance with a predetermined schedule or a scheduling order

upon the reception of a request (Column 6, lines 1-15) as taught by Fell in order to have

a automated transfer of files in a cost effective manner (Column 1, lines 21-24) as

disclosed by Fell.

Conclusion

11.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Farzana E. Hossain whose telephone number is 571-

272-5943. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:00 am to

4:30 pm.

          If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Christopher Grant can be reached on 571-272-7294. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

FEH
May 26, 2006

VIVEK SRIVASTAVA
PRIMARY EXAMINER